

also find that SWBT's Extended Area Service (EAS) additive charge meets our reciprocal compensation requirements because EAS additives are reciprocal in nature and entirely optional. We also decline to set reciprocal compensation rates for Internet-bound traffic from an end user.

30. *Checklist Item 14—Resale.* SWBT demonstrates that it makes telecommunications services available for resale in accordance with sections 251(c)(4) and 252(d)(3), and thus satisfies the requirements of checklist item 14. This checklist item requires SWBT to offer other carriers all of its retail services at wholesale rates without unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations so that other carriers may resell those services to an end user. This checklist item ensures a mode of entry into the local market for carriers that have not deployed their own facilities. SWBT also makes its retail telecommunications services available for resale without unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations. We also find that SWBT satisfies the provisioning requirements of checklist item 14. SWBT provisions competitive LECs' orders for resale in substantially the same time and manner as for its retail customers.

31. *Section 272 Compliance.* SWBT demonstrates that it will comply with the requirements of section 272. Pursuant to section 271(d)(3), SWBT must demonstrate that it will comply with the structural, transitional, and nondiscriminatory requirements of section 272, as well as certain requirements governing its marketing arrangements. SWBT shows that it will provide interLATA telecommunications through structurally separate affiliates, and that it will operate in a nondiscriminatory manner with respect to these affiliates and unaffiliated third parties. In addition, SWBT demonstrates that it will comply with public disclosure requirements of section 272, which requires SWBT to post on the Internet certain information about transactions with its affiliates. Finally, SWBT demonstrates compliance with the joint marketing requirements of section 272.

32. *Public Interest Standard.* We conclude that approval of this application is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. While no single factor is dispositive in our public interest analysis, our overriding goal is to ensure that nothing undermines our conclusion, based on our analysis of checklist compliance, that markets are open to competition. We note that a strong public interest

showing cannot overcome failure to demonstrate compliance with one or more checklist items.

33. Among other factors, we may review the local and long distance markets to ensure that there are not unusual circumstances that would make entry contrary to the public interest under the particular circumstances of this Application. We find that, consistent with our extensive review of the competitive checklist, barriers to competitive entry in the local market have been removed and the local exchange market today is open to competition. We also find that the record confirms our view that a Bell Operating Company's (BOC's) entry into the long distance market will benefit consumers and competition if the relevant local exchange market is open to competition consistent with the competitive checklist.

34. Another factor that could be relevant to our analysis is whether we lack sufficient assurance that markets will remain open after grant of the application. We find that the performance monitoring and enforcement mechanisms developed in Texas, in combination with other factors, provide meaningful assurance that SWBT will continue to satisfy the requirements of section 271 after entering the long distance market. Where, as here, a BOC relies on performance monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to provide such assurance, we review the mechanisms involved to ensure that they are likely to perform as promised. We conclude that these mechanisms have a reasonable design and are likely to provide incentives sufficient to foster post-entry checklist compliance.

35. *Section 271(d)(6) Enforcement Authority.* Congress sought to create incentives for BOCs to cooperate with competitors by withholding long distance authorization until they satisfy various conditions related to local competition. We note that these incentives may diminish with respect to a given state once a BOC receives authorization to provide interLATA service in that state. The statute nonetheless mandates that a BOC comply fully with section 271's requirements both before and after it receives approval from the Commission and competes in the interLATA market. Working in concert with state commissions, we intend to monitor closely post-entry compliance and to enforce vigorously the provisions of section 271 using the various enforcement tools Congress provided us in the Communications Act. Swift and effective post-approval enforcement of

section 271's requirements is essential to Congress' goal of achieving last competition in local markets.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Magalie Roman Salas,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-17287 Filed 7-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, July 10, 2000, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's Board of Directors will meet in closed session, pursuant to sections 552b(c)(2), (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii), (c)(9)(B), and (c)(10) of Title 5, United States Code, to consider matters relating to the Corporation's supervisory, corporate, and receivership activities.

The meeting will be held in the Board Room on the sixth floor of the FDIC Building located at 550—17th Street, NW, Washington, DC.

Requests for further information concerning the meeting may be directed to Mr. Robert E. Feldman, Executive Secretary of the Corporation, at (202) 898-6757.

Dated: July 6, 2000.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

**James D. LaPierre,**  
*Deputy Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-17441 Filed 7-6-00; 10:22 am]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-M

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

[Notice 2000-14]

### Status of Civil Enforcement Actions Involving Coordinated Party Expenditures

**AGENCY:** Federal Election Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission has adopted a policy statement that provides guidance to candidates and political party committees on the status of certain civil enforcement actions under the Federal Election Campaign Act pending Supreme Court resolution of the issues presented in the Tenth Circuit's decision in *FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee*.

**DATES:** June 20, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Louise Wides, Assistant Staff Director,